

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the above-mentioned, final office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-10, were rejected. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6-9 were rejected under the five-way combination of Longoni, a TSG-RAN working group 2 document, Hansen, and Lee. Claims 2, 5, and 10 were rejected under section 103(a) over the 6-way combination of Longoni, the TSG-RAN document, Vialen, Hansen, Lee and well-known prior art.

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 8 over the cited combination of references used there against. Specifically, the applicants traverse the Examiner's reliance upon Longoni for showing reception of a reconfiguration command that includes an activation time at which a reconfiguration is to be applied.

In the rejection of the independent claims, the Examiner relied upon Longoni for showing a method for performing a cell update during a reconfiguration procedure, for receiving a reconfiguration command including an activation time at which a reconfiguration is to be applied, and for detecting a trigger event which indicates that a cell update is required. The Examiner acknowledged that Longoni does not disclose delaying initiation of a cell update until the reconfiguration has been applied. But, the Examiner relied upon the TSG-RAN document for showing delaying initiation of a cell update until a reconfiguration has been applied.

The Examiner further acknowledged that neither Longoni nor the TSG-RAN document disclosed that a configuration command is received from the communication system. The Examiner, however, relied upon Vialen for showing that a communication system sends a reconfiguration command.

The Examiner also acknowledged that neither Longoni, the TSG-RAN document, nor Vialen disclosed that a configuration command is received at the mobile terminal. However, the Examiner relied upon Hansen for disclosing that configuration commands are transmitted by an electronic device.

And, the Examiner further acknowledged that none of Longoni, the TSG-RAN document, Vialen, and Hansen discloses user equipment that detects a trigger event. But, the Examiner relied upon Lee for disclosing a mobile station that detects an RSSI in the process of handoff.

Specifically, the Applicants traverse the Examiner's reliance upon Longoni for disclosing a reconfiguration command including an activation time at which a reconfiguration is to be applied. The Examiner placed particular reliance upon paragraphs 3, 4 and 9 for disclosing an MS routing information message and a cell update request message and noted that the reconfiguration process inherently includes an activation time.

As presently-recited, the receiving and detecting are stated to be performed at the user equipment. And, the recitation of receiving states that a reconfiguration command is received from the communications system. The cell update request message relied upon by the Examiner is indicated in paragraph 4 to be a mobile-station request, that is to say a request sent by a mobile station to a network. The cell update request message disclosed in Longoni, therefore, cannot be the equivalent of the reconfiguration command recited in the claims nor can the recitation of the receiving be equivalent. While the term, the MS routing information message is only noted in paragraph 4, this message appears to be intended to be the equivalent of the cell update request message. Therefore, the MS routing information message is also believed to be a message originated at a mobile station for communication to a network. The equivalency of the MS routing information message and cell update request message in Longoni for showing the reconfiguration command recited in the claims is, therefore, believed to be in error.

While the Examiner additionally notes that the reconfiguration process inherently includes an activation time, the applicants assert that irrespective of the validity of the Examiner's note, the recitation is for receiving a reconfiguration command that includes an activation time. And, the activation time is stated to be a time at which a reconfiguration is to be applied. And, while a reconfiguration process might inherently have an activation start time, the recitation of the claim is to receive a reconfiguration command in which the reconfiguration

command includes an activation time. Even assuming that the MS routing information message or cell update request message is the equivalent to the reconfiguration command recited in the claims, there still additionally is no disclosure of such a message received at a user equipment that includes an activation time at which a reconfiguration is to be applied. Independent claims 3, 6, and 8 are believed to be distinguishable over Longoni for the same reasons. The other references of the TSG-RAN document, Vialen, Hansen, and Lee were neither cited for showing a reception of a reconfiguration command, including an activation time, nor appear to disclose a reconfiguration time or its reception. Therefore, the applicants further believe that no combination of these references can be made with Longoni to form the invention as now-recited.

As the dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims, these claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited combinations of references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.

In light of the foregoing, therefore, independent claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 and the dependent claims dependent thereon are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims, in light of the foregoing, is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com